

Remarks

Reconsideration of this Application is respectfully requested.

Upon entry of the foregoing amendment, claims 1-6, 9-11, 13-16, and 18-26 are pending in the application, with 1, 11, and 14 being the independent claims. Claims 7, 8, 12, and 17 are sought to be cancelled without prejudice to or disclaimer of the subject matter therein. Claims 1, 14, 23, and 24 are sought to be amended.

Based on the following remarks, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider all outstanding objections and rejections and that they be withdrawn.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claims 8, 12, 17, 23, and 24 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C § 112, second paragraph, as being allegedly indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which the applicant regards as the invention. Specifically, the Examiner argues that the trademark "MACROVISION" in claims 8, 12, 17, 23, and 24 renders the claims indefinite because it is unclear whether the limitation(s) following the phrase are part of the claimed invention.

Claims 23 and 24 have been amended to remove the trademark "MACROVISION." Claims 8, 12, and 17 have been cancelled by the above amendment. Reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection is therefore respectfully requested.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102

The Examiner rejected claims 1-6, 9-11, 13-16, 18-22, and 25-26 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being allegedly anticipated by Ohara, *et al.*, U.S. Patent No. 5,694,588 (Ohara). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Claim 1 is amended herein to recite, among other features, “a programmable combinational logic module, coupled to said plurality of microsequencers that generates control signals based on the flags produced by said plurality of microsequencers to support a copy protection process.” Applicants respectfully submit that Ohara does not disclose at least the aforementioned feature of claim 1, for at least the reasons discussed below.

Ohara describes a processing system comprised of a plurality of processing elements that are capable of receiving input data, processing the input data in parallel, and then outputting processed data. (Ohara, Col. 2, lines 44-46). The processing elements are grouped into a one-dimensional array and are all controlled by the same instruction provided by an instruction generator. (Ohara, Col. 5, lines 4-26). Certain instructions (e.g., jump on certain flag test) passed to the array of processing elements from the instruction generator have execution dependencies that are based on flags. A processing element would take one of two actions based on the state (0 or 1) of a flag, either executing the conditional instruction or moving on in the program sequence. (Ohara, col. 13, lines 41-44).

The applicants, on the other hand, teach of flags generated by a plurality of microcontrollers that are subsequently utilized by programmable combinational logic to generate control signals that support a copy protection process. (Specification, ¶ 0032). At most, Ohara describes flags being utilized by processing elements in the

conditional execution of an instruction. Ohara does not teach or suggest of flags being utilized by programmable combinational logic for the generation of control signals that support a copy protection process, as recited claim 1.

Applicants respectfully submit that the Ohara patent does not disclose or suggest each and every element in Applicants' claim 1. A claim is anticipated only if each and every element set forth in the claim is found in a single prior art reference. MPEP § 2131. Accordingly, for at least the aforementioned reasons, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) are respectfully requested.

Moreover, currently amended claim 14 is also patentable over Ohara for reasons similar to those provided above. Specifically, claim 14 recites, among other features:

- (c) executing a set of programs from said plurality of programs by a plurality of microsequencers to generate a set of flags;
- (d) generating a control signal based on the set of flags through application of programmable combinational logic; and
- (e) outputting said control signal to implement a copy protection process.

Ohara does not teach or suggest of generating a control signal based on a set of flags through the application of programmable combinational logic to implement a copy protection process, as recited in claim 14.

Applicants respectfully submit that the Ohara patent does not disclose or suggest each and every element in Applicants' claim 14. A claim is anticipated only if each and every element set forth in the claim is found in a single prior art reference. MPEP § 2131. Accordingly, for at least the aforementioned reasons, reconsideration

and withdrawal of the rejection of claim 14 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) are respectfully requested.

Claims 2-6 and 9-10 depend upon claim 1, and claims 15-16, 18-22, and 25-26 depend on claim 14. Because each dependent claim incorporates all of the elements of the independent claim from which it depends, as well as additional features, the above arguments made with respect to claims 1 and 14, apply a fortiori to claims 2-6, 9-10, 15-16, 18-22, and 25-26. Reconsideration and allowance is respectfully requested of claims 1-6, 9-10, 14-16, 18-22, and 25-26.

Claim 11 recites, among other features, "a video output interface coupled to said video encoder, wherein said video encoder includes a timing generator."

Applicant respectfully submits that Ohara does not disclose at least the aforementioned feature of claim 11, for at least the reasons discussed below.

In FIG. 1 of Ohara a video system using a synchronous vector processor is illustrated. FIG. 1 includes a tuner 112 coupled to an analog-to-digital converter 116. The tuner 112 disclosed in the Ohara patent produces a composite or component video signal from signals received by antenna 110. (Ohara, col. 4, lines 32-36). The processed video signal is then converted to a digitized video signal by the analog-to-digital converter 116. (Ohara, col. 4, lines 47-49). The examiner appears to suggest that the analog-to-digital converter 116 is being used, in some form, as a video encoder. Applicants respectfully point out that analog-to-digital converter 116, used as a simple video encoder, does not include a timing generator.

In claim 11, a video encoder is expressed as including a timing generator. A timing generator, as described in the present specification, provides control signals to support output video signals and copy protection standards. (Specification, ¶ 0021).

Ohara does not teach or suggest a "video output interface coupled to said video encoder, wherein said video encoder includes a timing generator," as recited in claim 11.

Applicants respectfully submit that the Ohara patent does not disclose or suggest each and every element in Applicants' claim 11. A claim is anticipated only if each and every element set forth in the claim is found in a single prior art reference. MPEP § 2131. Accordingly, for at least the aforementioned reasons, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections of claim 11 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) are respectfully requested.

Claim 13 depends upon claim 11. Because each dependent claim incorporates all of the elements of the independent claim from which it depends, as well as additional features, the above argument made with respect to claim 11, applies a fortiori to claim 13. Reconsideration and allowance is respectfully requested of claims 11 and 13.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 7, 8, 12, 17, 23, and 24 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ohara in view of Kori (U.S. Patent No. 6,035,094). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Claims 7, 8, 12, and 17 have been cancelled herein without prejudice to or disclaimer of the subject matter contained therein. The rejections of claims 7, 8, 12, and 17 are therefore rendered moot.

To establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness, three criteria must be met. First, some motivation or suggestion must exist in the reference or in the knowledge

generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the reference. *In re Vaeck*, 947 F.2d 488, 493, 20 USPQ 1438, 1443 (Fed. Cir. 1991). Second, the reference must reveal a reasonable expectation of success. *Id.* Finally, the reference must teach or suggest all the claim limitations. *In re Royka*, 490 F.2d 981, 180 USPQ 580 (CCPA 1974).

Claims 23 and 24 depend from currently amended claim 14. As described above, Ohara does not teach or suggest all the limitations of independent claim 14. Kori does not cure the defects of Ohara. Accordingly, Ohara in view of Kori does not teach each and every element of claim 14. For at least these reasons, and further in view of their own features, dependent claims 23 and 24 are patentable over Ohara in view of Kori. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection is therefore respectfully requested.

Conclusion

All of the stated grounds of objection and rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider all presently outstanding objections and rejections and that they be withdrawn. Applicants believe that a full and complete reply has been made to the outstanding Office Action and, as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes, for any reason, that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number provided.

Prompt and favorable consideration of this Amendment and Reply is
respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

STERNE, KESSLER, GOLDSTEIN & FOX P.L.L.C.



Edward J. Kessler
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 25,688

Date:

June 29, 2007

1100 New York Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20005-3934
(202) 371-2600

650512_1.DOC